Remarks

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application.   No claims are amended, cancelled, or added.   In view of the following remarks, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-15, 18-21, and 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Szymanski *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,337). Applicant traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Claim 1 recites, among other things, an event manager that receives the notification of the event from the event filter over the network, and disperses the event over the network.   Independent claims 7, 13, and 19 include similar recitations, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, a plurality of application processes may be provided over a network.   For example, the application processes may include router processes (*e.g.*, message delivery of email voice mail, facsimiles, *etc.*), database processes (*e.g.*, email client access document management systems, data storage, *etc.*), and other processes (*e.g.*, calendaring, scheduling, *etc.*)(see the Specification at page 4, lines 15-21).   Users may subscribe to be notified of occurrences of particular application processes.   More particularly, notifications of events generated by the application processes are passed to an event manager over the network (see the Specification at page 5, line 17-page 6, line 6).   The event manager acts as an intermediary between the application processes and notification handlers by dispersing, over the network, the notifications to notification handlers that have been registered by users subscribing to notifications of the event that has occurred (see the Specification at page 9, lines 9-16).   The notification handlers that receive the notification then dispose of the notification by providing to the subscribers.

In contrast, Szymanski appears to be drawn to a method and apparatus for distributing information between computing entities that reside within a single computer, about events that occur within the single computer (see Szymanski at col. 1, lines 16-20). Szymanski discloses that the method and apparatus are designed specifically to address the need for efficient communications between different computing entities within a single computer (see Szymanski at col. 3, lines 54-59). Although Szymanski discloses that the computer may be adapted for communication with a network, the relevant events all occur on the single computer (see Szymanski at col. 6, lines 48-59), the event manager resides within an operating system that is run locally on the single computer. Therefore, Szymanski does not disclose at least a communications services network over which the events are dispersed. Surely the Examiner is not suggesting that operations that are dispersed to computing resources on a single computer, and thus are confined to the single computer, read on events that are dispersed over a communications services network to more than one computer.

Accordingly independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are allowable over the cited reference. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, and 24-28 depend from corresponding ones of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, and are allowable over Szymanski based on their dependency, as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

More particularly, with respect to dependent claims 25-28, which depend indirectly from claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, respectively, claim 25 recites, among other things, wherein the notification handler performs the second level filtering of notification of the event by determining whether contents of the event meet second level filtering criteria established by a subscriber, and communicating the event to the subscriber if the contents of the event meet the second level filtering criteria associated with the subscriber. Claims 26-28 include similar recitations, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, notification handlers may receive sufficient information within events to perform a second level filtering on the event and dispose of the event according to the second level filtering (see the specification at page 7, lines 5-

7). For example, the second level of filtering may include filtering events for delivery to a subscriber (*i.e.*, outside the computer) based on message content, filtering events based on a presence/awareness of the subscriber, filtering events by delivering events using a disposal mechanism determined by a time of day (*e.g.*, no telephone calls after 8:00 pm), or some other appropriate filtering (see the specification at page 9, lines 17-20).

The Examiner alleges that Szymanski discloses this feature in FIG. 9B, and the accompanying text (see the 8/09/2005 Office Action at page 4). FIG. 9B of Szymanski illustrates the processing of an event by the <u>event manager</u>, and does not provide details as to any filtering that takes place at a notification handler (see Szymanski at col. 17, lines 26 and 27). More particularly, the text accompanying FIG. 9B discloses that an event manager control unit of the event manager sends an event to each of a plurality of sequential consumers (which the Examiner analogizes to notification handlers at page 3 of the 8/09/2005 Office Action) one at a time (see Szymanski at col. 17, lines 58-61). Consumers are defined as entities within the computer and are <u>not</u> subscribers as known to one skilled in the art (see Szymanski at col. 4, lines 13 and 14). The consumers each process the event and then either forward the event to the next consumer in the sequence or declare that the event has been handled (see Szymanski at col. 17, lines 61-64). As such, the cited portion of Szymanski include no disclosure of a <u>subscriber</u>, second level filtering criteria established by the subscriber, or communicating events to the subscriber. Therefore, Szymanski does not disclose the notification handler performing the second level filtering of notification of the event by determining whether contents of the event meet second level filtering criteria established by a subscriber, and communicating the event to the subscriber if the contents of the event meet the second level filtering criteria associated with the subscriber. For at least these reasons the rejection of claims 25-28 is improper and must be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 10, 16, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Szymanski in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 5,925,108). These rejections are traversed on the following grounds.

The Examiner admits that Szymanski fails to disclose a registration manager, but alleges that Johnson teaches a registration manager that manages the registration of the plurality of notification handlers (see the Office Action at page 6, paragraphs 16a and 16b). Johnson apparently discloses event or message notification management in a computer system (see Johnson at col. 1, lines 25 and 26). However, Johnson does not teach or suggest modifying Szymanski to remedy the deficiencies of Szymanski discussed above. In particular, there is no motivation to combine Szymanski with Johnson to create a network of computers because Szymanski is directed to events that are confined to a single computer, and therefore, explicitly teaches away from modifications involving more than one computer (see Szymanski at col. 3, lines 54-59). Therefore, even if Examiner's allegation with respect to Johnson is accepted, claims 4, 10, 16, and 22 are distinguishable over the cited references at least because the combination of Szymanski and Johnson fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 11, 17, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Szymanski and Johnson, in view of Woodring *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,686). These rejections are traversed on the following grounds.

The Examiner admits that Szymanski and Johnson fail to disclose the use of a shared memory, but alleges that Woodring teaches using a shared memory (see the Office Action at page 8, paragraphs 21d and 21e). Woodring apparently discloses information streaming in a multi-process system using shared memory. However, Woodring does not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Szymanski and Johnson discussed above. Therefore, even if Examiner's allegation with respect to Woodring is accepted, claims 5, 11, 17, and 23 are distinguishable over the cited references at least because the combination of Szymanski, Johnson, and Woodring fail to provide the features of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: September 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-905-2000